REMARKS:

By the above amendment the Applicant has amended the claims to

– reduce the number of claims,

– eliminate multiple dependent claims,

– define the claims of this PCT Application in more according way to the US practice,

– define the invention in clearer way.

Following is a description of the amendments:

Claim 1: In this claim, three types of means have been added which restrict the scope of the claim.

- Paragraph b), referring to "means to aurally reproduce some fragment of some original extract". This is mentioned in many parts of the application, for example in claim 12.

- Paragraph c), referring to "means to choose at least a fragment of a blind extract". Choosing" is a necessary step in order to generate information or act in any way or form upon a fragment of blind extract. Before acting upon a fragment, the fragment must necessarily have been chosen.

    The word "choosing" is used instead of "selecting" to clarify what is meant, by avoiding the fact that "selecting" sometimes connotes "graphically marking". In this invention, when the intention is to mean "graphically marking", this is done explicitly. For example, in line 17 of page 16, the following is written for the preferred embodiment: "when the user selects a fragment of the extract, the system would graphically emphasize the word and the phrase in which it is located". In this case, selection is accompanied by graphically emphasizing, and it is explicitly indicated.

    Choosing extracts is mentioned in different parts of the application:

- In line 32 of Page 7 of the Specification, it is written that "the invention would be implemented in a computerized system that would allow to select fragments of the blind extract, and therefore access to the fragments of the original extract to which they correspond, and, for example, listen to the aural playback of them"

- In line 8 of page 23, in claim 20, it is written that "…allows a user to interact with at least one of said blind extracts, and which allows the user to select fragments of said blind extract"

- In line 14 of page 23, in claim 21, it is generically explained that extracts can be shown and reproductions performed. In this claim, it is not specified whether it is the user that chooses the extracts or it is an automated system that does that.

- Paragraph d), referring to "means to generate information about said fragment of an original extract". In line 14 of page 10 of the Specification, the following is written: "In the preferred embodiment several types of blind extracts, containing different characteristics, are used with the purpose of providing additional information to the learner about the samples of the target language on which he/she is working"

Claim 14: The following text has been removed: [in a sequential fashion]. Removing this text provides clarity to the claim, and does not modify its meaning, because a sequence can be composed of a single event. Furthermore, "graphically marking" is mentioned in may parts of the application.

Claim 23: This claim has been amended in the same line as claim 1, so it is considered that the explanation given for claim 1 is applicable here.

Claim 36: This claim has been amended in the same line as claim 14, so it is considered that the explanation given for claim 14 is applicable here.

Claim 48: This claim describes the types of information that can provided in claim 1. It indicates four types:
- The generated information being "a playback of a fragment":
  - in line 9 of page 22 of the Claims, the following written: "...allows the user to select fragments of said blind extract and to perform aurally reproductions of one or more fragments of said original extract"
- The generated information being "information to clarify the meaning"
  - in line 6 of page 8 of the Specification the following written: "the blind extract can be used to distinguish the different words that exist in the aural production that is being listened to, and work on them, for example with the purpose of clarifying its meaning"
- The generated information being "example texts"
  - in line 6 of page 10 of the Specification, the following is written: "the user can select a given fragment of a blind extract and the system would have means to show a language sample which would be similar to the selected fragment.
- The generated information being "other type of information".

    –   in line 14 of page 10 of the Specification, the following is written: "In the preferred embodiment several types of blind extracts, containing different characteristics, are used with the purpose of providing additional information to the learner about the samples of the target language on which he/she is working"

Claim 49: This claim is the same as claim 3, but worded in clearer fashion.

Claim 50: This claim is a general case that was subsumed under claims 4-9

Claim 51: This claim is the same as claim 4, but removing the second division into syllables, therefore not adding new matter.

Claim 52: This claim specifies and clarifies the types of graphically emphasizing that can be done. This claim is dependent on claim 14, which explains that fragments of a blind extract can be graphically emphasized. The term "linguistically relevant" is just a short way to refer to all the types of fragments that can be emphasized. This claim exemplifies the types of fragments that can be marked, and does not add new matter:
- In line 25 of page 6, in the Specification, the following is written: "The blind extract is used to allow the learner to access to the different linguistic components of the original extracts, such as sounds, syllables, words, phrases and so on.".
- In line 17 of page 7, Exhibit 2 shows how the fragment that is associated to a phrase is graphically marked.
- In line 16 of page 22, claim 15 mentions the graphically marking of fragments associated to words.
- In line 19 of page 22, claim 16 mentions the graphically marking of fragments associated to syllables.
- In line 21 of page 19, the segmental blind extract is defined. Graphically marking the fragments associated to segments would be the direct application to segments of the actions that can be applied to words and syllables.

Claim 53: This claim follows the same line as claim 48, so it is considered that the explanation given for claim 48 is applicable here

Claim 54: It introduces some amendments which are equivalent to the amendments mentioned for claim 49, so it is considered that the explanation given for claim 49 is applicable here.

Claim 55: It introduces some amendments which are equivalent to the amendments mentioned for claim 50, so it is considered that the explanation given for claim 50 is applicable here.

Claim 56: It introduces some amendments which are equivalent to the amendments mentioned for claim 51, so it is considered that the explanation given for claim 50 is applicable here.

Claim 57: This is the same claim as claim 44, but worded in a way that is used in US patents.

Claim 58: This is the same claim as claim 47, but worded in a way that is used in US patents.